REQUEST: NON-COMPETITIVE CONTRACT

APPROVED

	Commissioner of Finance & Administration Date:		
Each of the request items below indicates specific information that A REQUEST CAN NOT BE CONSIDERED IF INFORMATION PROVIDED CLEARLY ADDRESS EACH OF THE REQUIREMENTS INDIVIDUALI	DED IS INCOMPLETE, NON-RESPONSIVE, OR DOES NOT		
RFS.# 440.00-375			
STATE AGENCY NAME: TENNESSEE DEPARTMENT OF	TRANSPORTATION (TDOT)		
SERVICE CAPTION: EValuation of Roadway Efficiency (EVE)			
PROPOSED CONTRACTOR: University of Tennessee			
CONTRACT START DATE: (if date is < 60 days after F&A receipt, attach required explanation)	March 1, 2005		
LATEST POSSIBLE END DATE: (including ALL options to extend) February 28, 2010			
TOTAL MAXIMUM COST: (including ALL options to extend)	\$309,808		
APPROVAL CRITERIA: X (select one) use of Non-Competitive Negotiation is in the best interest of the state			
only one uniquely qualified ser	vice provider able to provide the service		
ADDITIONAL REQUIRED REQUEST DETAILS BELOW (address	each item immediately following the requirement text)		
(1) description of service to be acquired: To incorporate the specific project selection criteria developed be software known as EVE to provide maximum flexibility in assign in the programming process.	y TDOT's Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) into the ing specific program weight in order to support sensitivity analyses		
Technical Assistance, Technology Transfer for EVE Mainten (Second Year), Technology Transfer (Conclusion of Project) Final Report	d is being utilized as a key input to defining statewide highway ederal funding legislation) require that all state departments of phase of the project will provide the following tasks: us Updates, Bicycle Planning-Route Suitability. Peak-Spreading ance (First Year), Technology Transfer for EVE Maintenance		
(3) Explanation of whether the service was ever bought by the	e procuring agency in the past, and if so, what method was		

used to acquire it:

EVE development was begun in 1996. UT was selected as the vendor under Contract CUT 107, RES 1069. (This was considered Phase 1 of a multi-phase contract.) Work was continued with Phase 2 under Contract CUT 300, RES 1251. At the time the University of Tennessee was selected, F&A policy exempted institutions of higher education from the non-competitive selection process. Therefore, RFPs were not utilized. UT now has all the tools in place as well as the expertise and experience for the research project we are now requesting.
(4) name and address of the proposed contractor's principal owner(s): (not required if proposed contractor is a state education institution)
(5) evidence that the proposed contractor has experience in providing the service and evidence of the length of time the contractor has provided service: The contractor has successfully developed both previous phases of the EVE software (as described in question 3).
(6) documentation of OIR endorsement of the Non-Competitive procurement request : (required only if the subject service involves information technology)
select one: Documentation Not Applicable to this Request Documentation Attached to this Request
(7) documentation of Department of Personnel endorsement of the Non-Competitive procurement request : (required only if the subject service involves training for state employees)
select one: Documentation Not Applicable to this Request Documentation Attached to this Request
(8) description of procuring agency efforts to identify reasonable, competitive, procurement alternatives rather than to use non-competitive negotiation: As described in question 3, at the time this program was begun institutions of higher education were exempted from the non-competitive justification process. The University of Tennessee had successfully completed projects of a similar nature and were the logical university to proceed with this project.
(9) justification of why the state should acquire the service through Non-Competitive Negotiation rather than through A competitive process. As this is a continuation of the development process initiated in 1996, it is in the best interest of the State to contract with the University of Tennessee. No other contractor has the background experience with this program, or the knowledge and expertise.
AGENCY HEAD REQUEST SIGNATURE: (must be signed by the ACTUAL procuring agency head as detailed on the Signature Certification on file with OCR — signature by an authorized signatory will be accepted only in documented exigent circumstances)
SIGNATURE DATE:

03/26/1995 01:14 12/21/2004 08:31 6155320471

OIR ADMINISTRATION

PAGE 01

requestantec 01610s



FAX TRANSMITTAL

		·
TO:	Bill Exell, Chief Executive Officer Office for information Resources	FAX # 532-0471
FROM:	Vic Mangrum, Director of TDOT iT	FAX # 741-0861
DATE:	December 14, 2004	
RFS#	NUMBER	
RE:	OIR Procurement Endorzement Documentation for — Evaluate Efficiency (EVE)	tion of Roadway
		<u> </u>

NUMBER OF FAX PAGES (INCLUDING COVER): 6

The proposed, service procurement documents referenced above are hereby forwarded to the Office for Information Resources (OIR) for review. The subject scope of services appears to include information systems services or information technology support activities.

This communication seeks to ensure that OIR is aware of the procurement and has an opportunity to review the matter to determine whether OIR is supportive. Please indicate OIR endorsement of the procurement described by signature below and return this communication at your earliest convenience (note the return FAX number above).

If you have any questions or concerns about this matter, please call Vic Mangrum, at 615-532-9867

Thank you for your help.

Attachment

OIR ENDORSES THE SUBJECT PROCUREMENT REQUEST

Officedor information Resources

Date